

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION EIGHT

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SAKEENAH SIMPSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B263958

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MA057848)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Daviann L. Mitchell, Judge. Affirmed.

David Blake Chatfield, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

In June 2013 Sakeenah Simpson pleaded no contest to one count of false personation of another by way of a written instrument with the intent that the instrument be recorded, delivered, or used as true. (Pen. Code, § 529, subd. (b)(2).) She was placed on formal probation after being given a suspended three-year state prison sentence

Simpson's probation was later revoked and she was ordered to complete her prison term. In March 2015 she then filed a petition for resentencing under Penal Code section 1170.18, asking that her conviction be reclassified and resentenced as a misdemeanor. On April 15, 2015, the trial court denied the petition because Simpson's offense was not eligible for resentencing under the statute.

Simpson filed a notice of appeal. On October 27, 2015, her appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) in which no issues were raised. The brief included a declaration from counsel that he had reviewed the record and had advised Simpson that such a brief would be filed and that she could file a supplemental brief if she chose to. On October 28, 2015, this court sent Simpson a letter advising her that a *Wende* brief had been filed and that she had 30 days to submit a brief raising any issues she wanted us to consider.

Simpson filed a supplemental brief which seems to contend that she had somehow already served her time on this case, or had been serving time on another case and should not have been further incarcerated. Nothing in the record before us supports that contention, but further facts maybe open to development by way of a habeas corpus petition. Her notice of appeal mentions both that issue and the resentencing review.

We have examined the entire record in light of these contentions and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

RUBIN, ACTING P. J.

WE CONCUR:

FLIER, J.

GRIMES, J.